Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PRESTON JONES, Plaintiff, v. NUTIVA, INC., Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-00711-HSG (KAW)

ORDER TERMINATING 8/10/16 JOINT DISCOVERY LETTER

Re: Dkt. No. 45

On August 10, 2016, the parties filed a joint discovery letter regarding Defendant's alleged failure to fully respond to various discovery devices. (Dkt. No. 45.) Thereafter, the joint letter and all other discovery in this case were referred to the undersigned.

All joint letters must comply with the Court's standing order, including the provision that "a separate joint letter [be filed] for each discovery dispute (i.e. if the parties have disputes regarding specific interrogatories and requests for production, they must file two letters)." (Standing Order for Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore ¶ 13.) Here, the instant joint letter does not address the substance of the multiple disputes at issue, and does not provide the undersigned with the information necessary to resolve the disputes.

Accordingly, the Court TERMINATES the discovery letter and orders the parties to further meet and confer and file a separate, revised joint letter for each discovery device, not to exceed five pages. The letters shall be in the following format to ensure that the parties are addressing the same issues, and are doing so in a manner that facilitates the Court's resolution of the remaining disputes:

A. Request for Production No. 7

[Summarize the issue and reproduce the request.]

Plaintiff's Position

	1	[Plaintiff's position outlining why Defendant's response is deficient and
	2	the relief requested.]
	3	Defendant's Position
	4	[Defendant's rationale as to why it has fully responded to the request, etc.]
	5	B. Request for Production No. 12
	6	[Summarize the issue and reproduce the request.]
	7	Plaintiff's Position
	8	[Plaintiff's position outlining why Defendant's response is deficient and
	9	the relief requested.]
	10	<u>Defendant's Position</u>
	11	[Defendant's rationale as to why it has fully responded to the request, etc.]
Пä	12	
1110111	13	(See Standing Order for Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore ¶ 13.) Additionally, the parties
Noturem District of Camorina	14	should attach the propounded discovery and the applicable responses as exhibits to the joint
	15	discovery letter. The parties need not attach correspondence. All exhibits should be tabbed and
I DIS	16	physically attached to the corresponding letter with a staple or brads.
	17	IT IS SO ORDERED.
	18	Dated: August 12, 2016
	19	KANDIS A. WESTMORE
	20	United States Magistrate Judge
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	